DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 562 JC 800 071

AUTHOR Ireland, Jackie
TITLE Community Services: A Position Paper.
INSTITUTION National Council on Community Services and Continuing Education.
PUB DATE [79]
NOTE 35p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Board of Education Role; Budgets; Community Colleges; *Community Services; Cultural Enrichment; Financial Problems; Institutional Facilities; Institutional Role; *Junior Colleges; Older Adults; *Retrenchment; School District Autonomy; Staff Utilization; *State Aid; State Surveys; Tax Support
IDENTIFIERS Proposition 13 (California 1978)

ABSTRACT

College community services, traditionally funded by the levy of special purpose taxes, have been threatened by the passage of Proposition 13 and the resultant abolishment of permissive taxes. Survey data show that the average budget cut for community services was at least 50%. These cuts resulted in: (1) a 76% increase in "fee" courses and a 24% decrease in community services courses, (2) a 72.8% reduction in community services staff, (3) cultural deprivation for senior citizens and the economically disadvantaged, and (4) restriction of public use of campus facilities. However, Proposition 13 carried no mandate to change the basic mission of the California community colleges, and state funds should be provided--as they are in other states--to assure the continuation of community services which cannot be self-supporting. These special funds should provide 90% of the 1977-78 base year community services program budget, and any institution not budgeting for community services at 90% of its 1977-78 level should have the amount intended for community services, but not so used, subtracted from the next year's budget allocation. The report appendix includes survey data gathered by the California Community College Community Services Association and El Camino College to determine the effects of Proposition 13 on community colleges. (JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED180562

Community Services / A Position Paper

A Working Paper Sponsored by

The National Council on Community Services and Continuing Education

Dr. Jackie Ireland

Assistant Dean, Instruction / Community Services,
West Los Angeles College

President, California Community College Community Services Association (CCCCSA) 1977–79

Regional Representative, National Council on Community Services and Continuing Education

---

Council Address

Yoshio Nakamura, President
The National Council on Community Services and Continuing Education

Office of Community Services
Rio Hondo College
Whittier, California 90608

JC 800 071

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Yoshio Nakamura

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PREFACE

In 1951, the California Legislature granted Boards of Education the authority to levy a special purpose tax for the funding of Community Services. Local boards were empowered to levy up to five cents per $100 of assessed property valuation.

Although all community college districts in the State did not always levy this permissive tax and many districts did not levy the full five cents, this tax provided the major source of funding for Community Services.

Two major results developed from the Community Services tax.

1. California community colleges were able to provide a wide variety of non-credit educational, cultural and recreational programs at little or no cost to the people. Campuses also literally became civic centers for their local communities. Through these programs, millions of Californians were served annually by Community Services.

2. Because of its own funding source, Community Services was viewed as a separate entity by other segments of education. And as a separate entity, Community Services was expected to pay its own way.

With the passage of Proposition 13 in June 1978, all permissive taxes in the state were abolished. Two major results occurred immediately as the Community Services tax came to an end.

1. Community Services programs were cut drastically.

2. The prevailing sentiment was that it would be unlikely, perhaps even impossible or illegal, to provide funding for Community Services from a source other than a local permissive tax.

Community Services supporters throughout the state had their work cut out for them. Those with the power to make educational decisions needed to understand that Community Services was an integral part of a comprehensive community college. And, as such, a stable and appropriate plan for funding Community Services had to be formulated.

This position paper is addressed to the issues that became important to Community Services in California. Hopefully, the principles and concepts presented can be of value to the continuation and future of Community Services in all states.

INTRODUCTION

The January 1979, staff report to the Board of Governors on the Community College Long-Term Finance Plan makes several points that are particularly significant.

1. The mission and goals of California community colleges should be maintained. This means that our colleges will continue to be strongly community-oriented.

2. Included in the Board of Governors' goals that are of prime importance for finance proposals is the concept of diversity of programs, methods, and services.

3. Recognition is given to the fact that passage of Proposition 13 carried with it no mandate to change the basic purposes of California community colleges or no mandate to decrease services or to eliminate certain individuals from eligibility for services.

In spite of the foregoing philosophy, Community Services has been cut so drastically that there has been a negative impact upon the community-based orientation of our colleges.

This paper attempts to present a realistic picture of what has happened to Community Services, indicates why cutbacks in this area are detrimental, and proposes a plan for the financial support of Community Services.

THE EFFECT OF PROPOSITION 13 ON COMMUNITY SERVICES

Budget Cuts

In spite of the fact that State budget allocations provided funds equivalent to 90% of the 1977-78 Community Services budgets, the average budget cut for Community Services was at least 50%. According to the fall CCCCSA survey, 1978-79 budget cuts for Community Services ranged from 13% to 95.6% for those offices not eliminated. Five colleges reported that their Community Services program was eliminated completely. Budget cuts per college averaged 56.6% of their 1977-78 budget. (See Appendix A for recent--Feb. 1979--substantiating data.) For the colleges investigated in the El Camino College survey, the total Community Services budget was $18,330,616 for 1977-78 and $9,081,933 for 1978-79. The average budget per college for these two years reflected a 50.5% reduction. (See Appendix B, Table 1.)

Program Reductions

According to the CCCCSA and El Camino College surveys, programs and services were curtailed or eliminated at the reporting colleges including a wide variety of cultural events--theatre, art, music, dance, and art gallery exhibits.

Public events such as films, lectures, health fairs; and other services such as career centers, women's programs, minority programs and speakers' bureaus also were cut drastically. Most severely curtailed were services and programs for senior citizens. (See Appendix B, Table 1A and Appendix C.)

Programs to be continued, although not at a pre-Proposition 13 level, include self-supporting programs, non-credit Community Services classes, and the use of campus facilities on a fee basis.

Data collected by the Finance Study show that Community Services fee courses increased 22% during fall 1978. This finding conflicts with other studies which show a reduction in Community Services courses. Many colleges transferred non-credit courses that were previously eligible for state apportionment to Community Services. Classes for which fees are charged increased 76%. (CCCCSA, Feb. 1979) (See Appendix A.) Community Services courses as constituted in the pre-Proposition 13 era were reduced. Therefore, it would be more accurate to conclude that "fee" courses increased as colleges sought alternative means of funding certain types of non-credit courses. On the other hand, traditional Community Services courses decreased by 24%. (El Camino College, Nov. 1978)

It would appear that the only Community Services programs likely to survive under the present circumstances are those that will be self-supporting. (Appendix D presents data indicating the type of self-support that must be attained.) As a result, cultural programs will be most drastically reduced in the post-Proposition 13 era. In addition, programs for those unable to pay--seniors, minorities, and the economically disadvantaged--will not survive.

Staff Reductions

The El Camino College study and the CCCCSA study provide evidence that indicates the passage of Proposition 13 resulted in Community Services staff reductions. According to the El Camino College survey, the 635 full-time employees for 1977-78 were reduced to 173 in 1978-79--a 72.8% reduction. (See Appendix B, Table 2 and Appendix D.)

THE CONSEQUENCE OF COMMUNITY SERVICES CUTBACKS

It is important to recognize that drastic reductions in Community Services are detrimental to the maintenance of a community-based college system and to the constituencies served by our colleges.

Approximately 3.8 million people--an unduplicated estimate--were served annually by Community Services classes and programs prior to the Passage of Proposition 13. (Sharon, 1979)

Senior Citizens

Community Services cutbacks have had a severe impact upon senior citizens. (Hamer, 1979) (See Appendix E.) Served by Community Services more than by any other segment of the college, the mobile but economically disadvantaged senior citizen as well as senior citizens in rest homes and convalescent hospitals have had the educational, cultural and recreational doors slammed in their faces. When Community Services is forced to abandon all programs that are not financially self-supporting, seniors' opportunities to take advantage of education become limited.

Cultural Programs

> Many community colleges provide the only local facilities for entertainment and cultural events. All community colleges need vehicles for the expression of educational efforts in drama, music and athletics. These events constitute entertainment for the community, while being instructional for students. (Finance Project Status Report, 1978)

Cultural programs have been cut more severely than any other Community Services program. According to the El Camino College survey, cultural programs have been cut from 60 to 75%. The Chancellor's Office statewide survey of Community Services indicates that in 1977-78, the pre-Proposition 13 era, Community Services provided in excess of 15,000 cultural activities. Post-Proposition 13 reflects a 60-75% reduction in cultural programs this year. Such reductions have impact throughout the state, but particularly in those communities where a college is the prime provider of cultural activity.

Therefore, another result of Community Services cutbacks is cultural deprivation for senior citizens, for those who are economically disadvantaged, and for those communities that depend on the college for cultural enrichment.

Public Use Of Campus Facilities

The permissive nature of the Civic Center Act, Section 82530 of the Education Code, states that governing boards may grant use of buildings and grounds upon such terms and conditions that the board deems proper. It is not mandatory that the board grant any use of school property for the above described public purposes. Without a commitment to fund public use of college facilities, we may be faced with one of two alternatives, either 1) totally closing down use of school property for public purposes or 2) only serving that segment of the public that can afford to pay all of the costs incurred for facility usage.

Closure of campuses to use by the public would deprive citizens of facilities that their tax dollars helped to create. Serving only that segment of the public that can afford to pay all of the costs incurred for facility usage is not consistent with the will of the people. A portion of AB2043, which dealt with public use of school facilities, would have removed the requirement that the use of school property be free under the Civic Center Act. Pressure from public groups entitled to free facility usage under the Civic Center Act resulted in the elimination any reference to the Civic Center Act in AB2043.

Thus, a final result of cutbacks in Community Services is restriction of public use of campus facilities and/or imposition of fees for such usage that is not in harmony with public preference.

Balanced Program Benefits

The benefits to be derived from a meaningful and balanced Community Services program include:

1. Community Colleges will be able to meet the lifelong learning needs of

our state citizenry.

In turn, this will provide, "an avenue for the citizenry of the state to develop the coping skills to achieve and sustain a suitable quality of life in an era of growing economic tension and disjointedness," and "a means to focus citizen energy and support on the critical national priorities of this time, and increasingly, the future..." (Kavanaugh, 1979).

2. Cultural, educational, and recreational programming can be reestablished for senior citizens.

3. The diversity of college programming can be increased to meet the cultural, educational, and recreational needs of the people. Not only will such diversity give balance to college programs, it will give balance to peoples' lives.

4. Campus facilities can be recognized as a civic center, and facility utilization by the public can be maximized.

> The stakes are high. Not only for the 106 institutions that form the largest single system of higher education in the world, but for the millions of Californians who find the needs of the future suddenly the needs of the day and will demand the educational resources to meet those needs. More than education is at stake for our citizens--the whole pattern of their lives in these uncertain times is in the balance. (Kavanaugh, 1979)

FUTURE FUNDING FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

Community Services must economize and reevaluate its programs, as all segments of the college must do. But it also must be funded at a level that will enable Community Services to continue to function and be responsive to community needs throughout the State.

Although limited data is available, it appears that Community Services provides highly cost effective programs. To illustrate, Rio Hondo College has investigated cost effectiveness by evaluating the Community Services program in

relation to cost per contact hour. The college Annual Report. "...shows a continuous reduction of the cost per contact hour in the use of local tax dollars, starting at 83¢ in the base year 1974-75 and dropping to 55¢ in 1977-78."

An equitable means of funding highly cost effective programs is particularly important in a time of financial restriction.

In order to determine an equitable basis for future funding, it is important to explore and understand certain fundamental concepts.

Participant Fees

Along with the reduction in Community Services budgets has been an increase in participant fees. There is nothing inherently wrong with charging fees for participation in Community Services programs. In fact, many Community Services programs can and should be self-supporting. However, there are other programs that cannot and should not be financially self-supporting. Programs for the economically disadvantaged, handicapped and seniors are among those that neither can nor should be self-supporting. And, these unfortunately are the programs that Community Services is forced to eliminate in the face of severe budget reductions.

> Is the education of adults worth while? Is it a part of the fundamental responsibility of American higher education? If the answer "is yes," and it should be, support ought to be forthcoming. ... Why should adult education pay its own way? Undergraduate, professional, and graduate education do not pay their own way. (Harrington, 1977)

"The common wisdom today is that, with the loss of the restricted 5-cent Community Services tax, the Community Services function is lost." (Welch, 1979) And, survival is defined only in terms of programs that can be self-supporting. Rather than fixating on the dichotomy of "no tax--no program" or "no self-supporting program--no program," it is beneficial to note that the Community Services function is alive and well in the other 49 states. Perhaps we can gain insight

into how Community Services should be funded in California from how it is funded in other states.

Community Services Funding: A National Perspective

"State tax funds are used nationally for Community Services and education. All states devote tax revenue from general funds for the support of the Community Services function." (Welch, 1979) (See Appendix F.) A nationwide survey of 770 public community colleges showed that greatest reliance was placed on tuition and fees with state tax funds ranking a close second. Western colleges, with California's restricted tax leading the way, claimed greater use of local tax funds followed by state tax funds. (Fletcher, 1978) "Community Services is no more expected to pay its entire way through fees than is the student service function or the transfer function or the vocational function." (Welch, 1979)

Therefore, while it is perfectly appropriate for California to fund Community Services in part by participant fees, it is equally appropriate to fund Community Services in part by general fund monies.

The Local Option Issue

A major concern centers on the state giving direction for the funding of a particular college function in a time when local control is being emphasized. Such direction is justified.

California educators have not been accustomed to recognizing the Community Services/Community Education function as an integral college function because of the separate and unique permissive tax that has funded Community Services since the 50's. In general, the traditional functions of higher education are nationally recognized as "...teaching, research, and service. Today many colleges and universities are placing greater emphasis on the third mission of service to the communities in which they are located." (Forum of Liberal Education)

In addition, "Community Services has been and should increase its role as a developer of matriculated student enrollment." (Welch, 1979)

> Men and women not registered for any course account for much of the attendance at art exhibitions, concerts, dance and dramatic performances, and fine arts lectures on campus. ... This leads adults to enroll in credit and non-credit courses. (Harrington, 1977)

For example, a Rio Hondo College survey revealed that "10% of the respondents enrolled in credit classes after first attending Community Services events or non-credit classes."

> The time when the development of enrollment through community education is most vitally needed is when matriculated students are few, and competition for these students is most keen. This seems likely to be a description of the next ten years. So from a cold-blooded tactical point of view, this is a poor time to reduce what should be the development arm of our institutions. (Welch, 1979)

Therefore, State encouragement of Community Services is appropriate in order to help the California educational system recognize the national trend that accords Community Services status as a major college function and a builder of collegiate enrollment.

Furthermore, some State encouragement of or protection for the Community Services function would actually preserve the concept of local strength rather than destroy it. It would affirm State commitment to local responsiveness in education.

Community Services has the unique capability of responding immediately to community needs. Extremely flexible by nature, Community Services can and does work directly with local constituencies to determine non-credit educational, cultural, recreational, and community development needs that can be met by the community college. Community Services has the capability to respond more quickly and more efficiently to these local needs than any other segment of the college. In fact, it can be said that Community Services provides the best and perhaps the only means of retaining local flexibility in an age of increased state centralization.

A Funding Proposal

The following proposal provides a plausible means of funding Community Services in California community colleges.

Incentives could be provided for those colleges that positively exercise their local option to recognize Community Services as a legitimate college function and provide funding accordingly.

To illustrate, the State has already provided the equivalent of 90% of the 1977-78 Community Services budget in the 1978-79 fiscal allotment. The devastation that Community Services faced this year would not have occurred if local boards and administrators had gone along with the spirit of this allocation and provided adequate funding for Community Services. However, it appears that the fact that the State provided 90% of the 1977-78 Community Services budget in 1978-79 block grant was not common knowledge. Enormous confusion existed with regard to many aspects of the short-term finance plan. And, the enormous confusion resulted in drastic cutbacks in Community Services. Therefore, given the value of Community Services to the constituencies served by the college and to the community-oriented approach to community college education in California, it would be appropriate to provide incentives for local boards and administrations to "keep the spirit" inherent in the 1978-79 State Block grant rather than devastate a major college function. The request for such a plan is not a request for an enormous change in the spirit of current community college financing. Rather, it is a means of rectifying a problem that occurred as a natural result of short-term financial planning.

It is therefore proposed that the State provide funding for Community Services at a level of 90% of the 1977-78 base year Community Services program budget. Colleges would then use this money to provide Community Services comparable to 90% of the services provided in the 1977-78 base year.

Those colleges not providing for 90% of the Community Services program budget in their local college budget would then have the amount intended for Community Services but not so used subtracted from the next years budget allocation.

Such an incentive plan should be in effect for a limited period of time--i.e. three to five years and reevaluated at the end of that time. This time frame should give local administrations the opportunity to recognize Community Services as a vital component of the institution and put it into its proper institutional perspective.

POSTSCRIPT

Although the particular funding proposal advocated in this paper was not adopted, the voices of the California Community College Community Services Association and Community Services practitioners throughout the State were heard. At their June 22, 1979 meeting, the Board of Governors in California took favorable action in behalf of Community Services.

The Board of Governors action relative to the community college long-term finance plan included Community Services in two important ways.

1. Community Services was established as one of the statewide objectives to be treated in the community college planning and accountability process.

2. A State funding mechanism was provided for Community Services.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

The Current Level of Community Services Budget, Non-Credit Class Enrollment, and Community Services Participation in California Community Colleges — A

The Impact of Proposition 13 on Community Services for California Community Colleges — B

Effects of Proposition 13 Passage on California Colleges Community Services Compiled by CCCCSA, Aug. 1978. — C

Effects of Proposition 13 on California Community Services a CCCCSA Report, Oct. 1978. — D

Decrease in Gold Card Holders in Los Angeles Community College District, Dec. 31, 1978. — E

Financing Patterns in 172 Colleges in 14 States (Excluding California) with Extensive Community Services/Continuing Education Programs, Fall 1978 Survey — F

APPENDIX A

The Current Level of Community Services Budget, Non-Credit Class Enrollment, and Community Services Participation in California Community Colleges.

A CCCCSA Survey-Feb. 1979
Compiled by Dr. Jerry Sharon

	1977-78	Projected 1978-79	Percentage Increase (Decrease)	
Total Community Services Budget	$14,595,074	$8,072,664	(45%)	(1)
Net Expense for Community Services	12,622,645	5,754,839	(54%)	(2)
No. of Noncredit Classes Scheduled in Fall Quarter	4,656	3,886	(17%)	
No. of Noncredit Classes Cancelled in Fall Quarter	600	1,001	67%	
No. of Fee Bearing Classes Scheduled in Fall Quarter	1,501	2,634	76%	
No. of Fee Bearing Classes Cancelled in Fall Quarter	314	831	165%	
Fall Quarter Enrollment in Non-credit Classes	97,188	66,100	(32%)	
No. of Participants (Exclusive of Classes) Served by Community Services	4,443,527	2,277,092	(49%)	

(1) In other words, only 55% and not 90% of 1977-78 total C.S. budget.
(2) In other words, only 46% and not 90% of 1977-78 net expenditure budget, after deducting income from participant fees.

This survey represents data from 36 colleges. The colleges reporting represent most of the major urban districts and a representative sample of the rest.

APPENDIX B

THE IMPACT OF PROPOSITION 13
ON COMMUNITY SERVICES FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

EL CAMINO COLLEGE - OIR 78-16 Nov. 1978

When California voters approved the now nationally known Proposition 13 in June of 1978, educators and lay persons were unable to know the impact that it would have on education, especially the community colleges. The extent of its influence may not be thoroughly understood until several years after the passage of the proposition. Because of the resulting reduction of funds to community colleges less than one month after the election, immediate and often drastic alterations and eliminations were made to staffs, programs, and services.

It is hypothesized that community services and specifically the fine arts aspect of community services were drastically reduced. The present study was designed to determine the extent of this reduction. Initially, areas which are typically included in Community Services were identified by consultation with Directors of Community Services of several community colleges in California. Two variables were investigated to determine reductions; (1) budget, and (2) number of full-time employees and full-time equivalents. A questionnaire was constructed to include these factors. A copy of the questionnaire is presented in the appendix.

The questionnaire was sent to each community college in California. Returns were received from 60 colleges. Seven of the colleges could not respond with accurate information. It was the experience of the present investigators that since the passage of Proposition 13, one of the resulting curtailments is the lack of staff to supply valid data. Because of this, a response of 50 per cent was viewed as being acceptable. The colleges submitting data were assumed to be representative of the colleges in the state. A list of colleges submitting data is found in the appendix as well as a list of colleges not responding.

For the colleges investigated, the total Community Services budget was $18,330,616 for 1977-1978 and $9,081,933 for 1978-1979. The average budget per college for these two years was $345,861 and $171,357. This was a 50.5 per cent reduction. The results of the budget data were divided into two tables, Table 1 and Table 1a. Table 1 reports on those services which are provided by all or most of the community colleges responding while Table 1a includes services that are less extensively provided (the maximum being seven colleges). From Table 1, it is seen that the areas of greatest reductions are Art (75.0 per cent reduction), Music (63.9 per cent reduction), and Dance (59.7 per cent reduction). The two areas of least reduction were short-term courses (24.5) and lecture (40.8).

From Table 1a it is seen that 16 areas had 100 per cent reductions; or in other words, were eliminated. These areas were career information center, center for new operations, chamber music series, child care, family films, library, natural history museum, other services, reading center, satellite campus, site improvement, special events, student center, utilities, weekend library, and the women's center. Four increases were identified, including: college theatre (1.5 per cent increase), readers theatre (5.3 per cent increase), TV-FM (5.4 per cent increase) and a new program for printing and distributing a schedule of classes.

Table 2 presents the number of full-time employees and the number of FTE's. Inasmuch as it was not possible for all responding districts to identify FTE's for each budget category, the list of services for Table 2 is shorter than the combined services of Tables 1 and 1a. From Table 2 it is seen that the 635 full-time employees for 1977-1978 were reduced to 173 in 1978-1979 which was a 72.8 reduction. The number of FTE's for the two years was 307.76 and 163.47 which resulted in a 46.9 per cent reduction. Other areas of high per cent reduction was the dance portion of the budget, child care, family films, library, planetarium, and the community service function portion of the budget. Two areas showed an increase in FTE. These areas were the short-term course portion of the budget and public information. One district showed no change in the area of administrative overhead, and one district showed no change in administrative support and capital outlay.

In summary, on the average, community services were reduced by one-half of those colleges studied. The greatest reductions were in the areas of music, dance, and art which programs were reduced from 60 to 75 per cent of the pre-Proposition 13 capacity.

Table 1

BUDGETARY CHANGES IN COMMUNITY SERVICES FROM 1977-1978 TO 1978-1979

Total 1977-1978 Budget	MEAN	TYPE OF COMMUNITY SERVICE	Total 1978-1979 Budget	MEAN	PER CENT REDUCTION
$18,330,616	$345,861	Total Community Services Budget	$9,081,933	$171,357	50.5
273,775	6,844	Art portion	68,579	1,714	75.0
617,165	14,353	Music portion	222,779	5,181	63.9
222,379	6,739	Dance portion	89,553	2,714	59.7
5,871,698	122,327	Community Service portion	2,608,283	54,339	55.7
2,024,001	47,978	Recreation portion	955,383	21,231	52.8
559,082	13,977	Drama portion	289,339	7,233	48.2
2,419,420	53,765	Civic Center functions portion	1,352,657	30,059	44.1
683,906	15,543	Lecture portion	404,804	9,200	40.8
1,362,807	34,070	Short-term course portion	1,029,539	25,738	24.5

Table 1a

BUDGETARY CHANGES IN COMMUNITY SERVICES FROM 1977-1978 TO 1978-1979
WHICH ARE LESS EXTENSIVELY PROVIDED

TOTAL 1977-1978 BUDGET	MEAN	TYPE OF COMMUNITY SERVICE	TOTAL 1978-1979 BUDGET	MEAN	PER CENT REDUCTION
$ 20,892	$ 20,892	Women's Center	$ 0	$ 0	100.0
7,638	7,638	Weekend Library	0	0	100.0
30,000	30,000	Utilities	0	0	100.0
250,000	250,000	Student Center	0	0	100.0
101,812	33,937	Special Events	0	0	100.0
36,083	36,083	Site Improvement	0	0	100.0
22,722	22,722	Satellite Campus	0	0	100.0
25,347	25,347	Reading Center	0	0	100.0
25,590	25,590	Other Services	0	0	100.0
3,301	3,301	Natural History Museum	0	0	100.0
32,643	32,643	Library	0	0	100.0
2,198	2,198	**Family Films**	0	0	100.0
179,439	89,720	Child Care	0	0	100.0
7,600	7,600	Chamber Music Series	0	0	100.0
31,034	31,034	Center for New Operations	0	0	100.0
7,291	7,291	Career Information Center	0	0	100.0
4,491	4,491	Cooperative Venture	218	218	95.1
7,599	7,599	Administration and Publications	390	390	94.9
23,028	11,514	Senior Citizens	3,000	1,500	87.0
35,151	35,151	Conservatory of Music	5,000	5,000	85.8
26,267	8,756	Film Series	3,800	1,267	85.5
11,071	11,071	Conferences, Workshops, Seminars	2,250	2,250	79.7
47,999	47,999	Indirect Support Charges	10,500	10,500	78.1
22,548	22,548	Semester Credit Course	5,000	5,000	77.8
91,741	13,106	Planetarium	22,340	3,191	75.6
33,000	11,000	Television Consortium	10,000	3,333	69.7
107,874	107,874	Campus Oper.,Contingencies,Employ.	35,503	35,503	67.1
49,856	49,856	Child Development Center	17,557	17,557	64.8
40,477	40,477	Seniors, Summer, Bldg., Retention	15,940	15,940	60.6
94,843	47,421	Supplies/Equipment(exc.art & rec)	44,519	22,260	53.1
116,752	116,752	Labor (inc. fringe benefits)	59,950	59,950	48.7
178,204	178,204	Full-time Employees	91,724	91,724	48.5
113,875	37,958	Security	62,033	20,678	45.5
126,287	126,287	Community Service Office	80,354	80,354	36.4
93,130	93,130	Miscellaneous	63,296	63,296	32.0
147,600	147,600	Outreach	103,360	103,360	30.0
318,489	79,622	Administrative Support	227,055	56,764	28.7
218,385	24,265	Public Information	158,813	17,646	27.3
32,843	32,843	Senior Adult Program	25,365	25,365	22.8
7,450	7,450	Contingencies	6,000	6,000	19.5
890,736	148,456	Salaries	718,239	119,706	19.4
63,591	63,591	Admin. Supply & Capital Outlay	60,096	60,096	5.5
49,344	49,344	Community Education Center	48,229	48,229	2.3
25,572	25,572	Match of Grants	25,572	25,572	0.0
0	0	Printing & Dist.Class Schedules	25,000	25,000	-
33,046	33,046	College Theatre	33,550	33,550	1.5 (Incr)
950	950	Readers' Theatre	1,000	1,000	5.3 (Incr)
64,360	64,360	TV-FM	67,818	67,818	5.4 (Incr)
10,709	3,570	Capital	30,000	10,000	180.1 (Incr)

Table 2

EMPLOYEES AND FULL-TIME EQUIVALENTS IN COMMUNITY SERVICES

FROM 1977-1978 TO 1978-1979

1977-1978			1978-1979		
NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES	FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT	TYPE OF COMMUNITY SERVICE	NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES	FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT	PER CENT REDUCTION
635		Total Community Services Budget	173		72.8
	307.76	Total Community Services Budget		163.47	46.9
	.30	Dance portion		0.00	100.0
	3.44	Child Care		0.00	100.0
	.07	Family Films		0.00	100.0
	3.75	Library		0.00	100.0
	.20	Planetarium		0.00	100.0
	39.58	Community Service portion		9.17	76.8
	22.40	Recreation portion		9.40	58.0
	18.75	Civic Center functions portion		8.70	53.6
	1.10	Security		.60	45.5
	5.45	Art portion		3.20	41.3
	7.67	Drama portion		4.75	38.1
	4.88	Music portion		3.20	34.4
	3.64	Lecture portion		3.35	8.0
	.10	Administrative Overhead		.10	0.0
	2.25	Adm./Support and Capital Outlay		2.25	0.0
	1.40	Public Information		2.40	71.4 (Incr)
	1.25	Short-term course portion		2.35	88.0 (Incr)

APPENDIX C

Effects of Proposition 13 Passage on
California Community Colleges Community Services
Compiled by CCCCSA
Aug. 1978

California Community Colleges Community Services were surveyed by regional representatives as to the effects Proposition 13 had on their services. Eighty out of a total of 104 (77%) responded. The data is summarized by college region on the attached chart.

The general picture for Community Services at California colleges is:

1. Community Services budgets have been cut an average of 75%, to be cut to 100% within one to two years.
2. Community Services operations are to become financially self-supporting to cover direct and indirect program costs.
3. Planned to be maintained are non-credit, short-term class programs and public facility usage available on a fee basis.
4. Program cuts include all free events, most cultural events, public events and other programs. The size of class programs will be reduced.

Community Services budgets throughout California Colleges are cut an average of 75%, based on available data and knowledge to date. One college had a 15% cut. The remaining college budgets ranged from 50% to 100%, and 5 colleges had their budgets eliminated. Twenty-one colleges had all program and staff budgets deleted, eliminating the entire Community Services program and department. All remaining are to be on a financially self-supporting basis. The term "self-supporting" is defined in terms of direct program costs, indirect program costs and/or administrative overhead. The breakdown of the number of colleges in these terms is as follows:

Colleges	Type of self-support
2	Cover part direct program costs
7	Cover all direct program costs
28	Cover direct & indirect program costs
4	Cover direct & indirect program costs and all administrative overhead
5	Cover direct & indirect program costs with no initial budget (100%) cut
13	Information not available

All free programs and services that were presented for the community have been eliminated at all colleges. The free programs included a wide variety of different events dependent upon the individual college, but affected many senior citizens' programs. The most severely affected type of program cut was cultural events--theatre, art, music and dance, including art galleries on campuses which have them. Seven colleges will try to maintain a few of their most successful cultural programs on a fee basis. Also cut almost completely were the public events, such as film, lectures, health fairs and festivals; and other programs, such as career centers, women's programs, minority programs, planetariums and speakers' bureaus.

All colleges except one foresee the non-credit classes, with a large reduction in the number of classes offered, as the total or major part of the program they will be able to offer on a self-supporting basis. Some colleges are interested in getting the California Civic Center act revised so that they can offer facility usage on a self-supporting basis.

In summary, major financial changes for California Colleges Community Services resulting from the passage of Proposition 13 have instigated major changes in the operational and programatic aspects of Community Services throughout the state.

Effects of Proposition 13 Passage on California College Community Services
Compiled by CCCCSA

REGION	% Budget Cut '78-79 over '77-78 (1)	# of Colleges with Comm.Svcs. Eliminated (2)	Programs Cut	Programs Maintained
1	75-100%	3	All free events Most public events (3) Most cultural events Majority of class programs	All on self-supporting basis: Small class program.
2	50-75%	4	All free events Most public events Most cultural events	All on self-supporting basis: Small class program. Public facilities on fee basis. (4)
3	75-100%	3	All free events Most public events Most cultural events Most other programs Majority of class programs	Most on self-supporting basis: Small class program. Public facilities on fee basis.
4	50-75%	2	All free events Most public events Most cultural events	Most on self-supporting basis: Small class program. Public facilities on fee basis.
5	75-100%	2	All free events Most cultural events	All on self-supporting basis: Small class program.
6	75-100%	2	All free events Most public events Most cultural events Most other programs Majority of class programs	All on self-supporting basis: Small class programs.

C-3

REGION	% Budget Cut '78-79 over '77-78 (1)	# of Colleges with Comm.Svcs. Eliminated (2)	Programs Cut	Programs Maintained
7	75-100%	4	All free events Most public events	All self-supporting basis: Small class program. A few cultural events on self-supporting basis.
8	75-100%	0	All Free events Most cultural events	All self-supporting basis: Small class program. Public facilities on fee basis. Public events on fee basis.
9	75-100%	1	All free events All other programs All cultural events	All self-supporting basis: Small class program. Public facilities on fee basis.
10	75-100%	0	All free events All other programs All cultural events	All self-supporting basis: Small class program.

C-4

(1) Based on available data. Some decisions regarding Community Services budgets have not yet been made.

(2) These figures are probably higher. Lack of response from some Community Services may be because they have been eliminated

(3) "Most" is defined as true for all except one or two colleges.

(4) Efforts are currently being made to effect a change in Civic Center law so that all civic center permits may be issued on a fee basis.

APPENDIX D

EFFECTS OF PROPOSITION 13 ON CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY SERVICES
a CCCCSA Report

Oct. 1978

A CCCCSA survey was conducted to determine the effect of the passage of Proposition 13 on Community Services offices throughout the State. A questionnaire regarding staff and budgetary cuts was sent to Community Services offices throughout the State. 43 out of 104 colleges, or 41% responded, a more than adequate representation to be able to generalize the data to all California Community Services offices.

Results indicated that 84% of the colleges had staff cuts. 174 Community Services staff members, or an average of 4.6 people per college, were affected in layoffs, transfers, and demotions. This figure does not include the five colleges whose Community Services staff were completely eliminated. Seven colleges (16%) had no staff cuts.

The following table summarizes the types of staff cuts:

# of staff laid off	127
# of staff transferred	40
# of demotions	1
# of vacancies cancelled	3
# of rearrangements where a position was lost	3
	174

1978-79 budget cuts for all state college Community Services ranged from 13.7% to 95.6% for those offices not eliminated. Budget cuts per college averaged 56.6% of their 1977-78 budget. With yearly inflation considered, the percentage is actually higher. The amount of financial loss for 22 colleges reporting figures was $5,632,474 for an average of $256,000 loss per college for the coming year. The highest loss was a $994,000 budget from one college for a 95.6% cut.

All 38 Community Services offices not eliminated must become self-supporting, at least to the extent of covering direct program costs. Below is a table summarizing the results of types of self-support colleges must sustain.

type of self-support	# of colleges	% of colleges
Direct program costs	7	18.4
Direct & indirect program costs	22	57.9
Direct & indirect program costs & all staff salaries	9	23.7

The data is not all in yet. Many colleges are still awaiting decisions from local boards. Also next year may be even more devastating for community services offices with larger budgetary and staff cuts, more offices eliminated and some, because of lack of time for planning and populations they serve, may be unable to meet the self-supporting requirements.

APPENDIX E

Decrease in Gold Card Holders
in Los Angeles Community College District

Dec. 31, 1978

compiled by Lois Hamer

College	Number of Gold Card Holders Prior to Passage of Prop.13	Current number of Gold Card Holders
East Los Angeles	2,000	11
Los Angeles City	9,000	50
Los Angeles Harbor	2,200	160
Los Angeles Mission	--*	25
Los Angeles Pierce	--*	--*
Los Angeles Southwest	750	6
Los Angeles Trade Tech	--*	10
West Los Angeles	2,500	115
Los Angeles Valley	10,500	943

* Information unavailable

APPENDIX F

Financing Patterns
in 172 colleges
in 14 States (Excluding California)
with Extensive Community Services/
Continuing Education Programs

Fall 1978 Survey

by Dr. Tim Welch

	Tax Revenues	fees/Tuition Internal Revenue	other
Use of College facilities by community	43.6%	52.9%	16.2%
Credit short courses	55.8%	77.9%	5.8%
Concerts, lectures, film, galleries	45.9%	54.6%	20.9%
Weekend conference	22.6%	56.3%	9.9%
Noncredit short courses	41.2%	86.6%	9.9%
Credit semester-length	70.3%	79.6%	8.1%
N/C semester length	41.2%	64.5%	5.2%
Off campus extension cntr.	54.6%	59.8%	9.3%
Community Theatre, symphony, festivals	27.3%	41.8%	18.0%
Forums, public debates	34.3%	31.9%	16.8%
Museums, planetariums, aquariums	9.8%	8.1%	2.9%
Broadcasting, telecasting, press	20.3%	16.2%	6.4%
Public information office	61.0%	13.9%	9.3%
Publications, design	52.3%	19.7%	7.6%

The percentages reported in each column represent the number of institutions claiming funding from a particular source. Many institutions report that Community Services and Continuing Education receives funding from more than one source. Therefore, percentages are not intended to add up to 100%.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Association of Colleges. "Forum for Liberal Education-Community Services." Washington, D.C.: May, 1978.

California Community College Chancellor's Office. "Finance Project: Status Report and Preliminary Working Papers." Sept. 1978.

California Community College Chancellor's Office. "1977-78 Data Survey and Fiscal Report on Community Services in California Community Colleges to the State Legislature in accordance with SB1664 and the Requirements of the Chancellor's Office."

_____. "1976-77 Data Survey and Fiscal Report on Community Services in California Community Colleges to the State Legislature in accordance with SB1664 and the Requirements of the Chancellor's Office."

_____. "1975-76 Data Survey and Fiscal Report on Community Services in California Community Colleges to the State Legislature in accordance with SB1664 and the Requirements of the Chancellor's Office."

California Community College Community Services Association. "Statewide Survey of the Effects of Proposition 13 on Community Services." Aug. 1978.

California Community College Community Services Association. "Statewide Survey of the Effects of Proposition 13 on Community Services." Oct. 1978.

California Community College Community Services Association. "Statewide Survey of the Effects of Proposition 13 on Community Services." Feb. 1979.

Dills, Senator Ralph C. et al. SB234 Jan. 1979.

Fletcher et al. "Community Education: The Community Services Division of the Community College." AACJC Monograph. April, 1978.

Garlock, Jerry C. "The Impact of Proposition 13 on Community Services for California Community Colleges." El Camino College Office of Institutional Research. Nov. 1978.

Hamer, Lois V. "Effects of Proposition 13 on Senior Adult Programs in Community Services." Presentation in behalf of the Educational Association on Aging to the CCCCSA Executive Board. Los Angeles: Feb. 1979.

Harrington, Fred Harvey. The Future of Adult Education. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1977.

Kavanaugh, Larry. Community Services and the Future of Community Colleges in California. Educational Record, 1979, 60 (2), 202-206.

McIntyre, Chuck. "Community College Long-Term Finance Plan." (Staff Presentation to the Board of Governors.) Jan. 1979.

Nakamura, Yoshio C. "Rio Hondo College Annual Report on Community Services 1977-78." Jan. 1979.

Rio Hondo College. "Accreditation Self-Study Committee Report on Community Services." (Draft) Dec. 1978.

Sharon, Jared. "Factors for an Unduplicated Count of Community Services Participants." Feb. 1979.

Welch, Tim. "The Financing and Future of Community Services." CCJCA Community Services Commission Draft. Jan. 1979.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
96 Powell Library Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

FEB 8 1980